



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,426	03/25/2005	David A. Bernard	OKC00480.US	4528
33900	7590	07/21/2006	EXAMINER	
FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC 100 NORTH BROADWAY SUITE 1700 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102-8820			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/529,426

Applicant(s)

BERNARD ET AL.

Examiner

M Rachuba

Art Unit

3723

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

M Rachuba  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 3723

7/15/06

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not convincing. Applicant argues that '732 does not anticipate a device with a predetermined angular orientation maintained with respect to a predetermined axial line, as the line cannot be interpreted as the longitudinal axis of the drill: the longitudinal axis moves as the drill is sharpened. The examiner disagrees. The drill moves forward and back along the longitudinal axis, the longitudinal axis is a line in space, the axis does not move longitudinally relative to itself, the drill moves longitudinally relative to the axis. The longitudinal axis is a predetermined axis. The angular orientation is set relative to the longitudinal axis, in that the drill is not pivoted relative to this axis. '732 does disclose that the drill is rotated about this axis, but the angular orientation is not changed. '732 also discloses maintaining a longitudinal length of the bit along the same axis as the bit is being sharpened. Note also that after one portion of material is removed, the bit is removed from the port, turned 180 degrees, and reinserted using the same guide feature to maintain the bit in the proper position. Again, please refer to '732, column 7, lines 43 through column 8, lines 64. Applicant has not claimed any structure that overcomes this rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b). Regarding applicant's arguments against the combined teachings of '732 and '478, applicant argues that the limitation "removeably connected to either one of said ports" is exclusive, that the collector must be connected to one, or the other of the ports at a time, and not to both ports simultaneously. The examiner disagrees. There is nothing in the claimed structure that would require the collector be connected to only one port. The collector taught by '478 is removeably connected to the device, and is coupled to either one of the ports when the other port is in use. See column 10, lines 31 through 53. Again, applicant has not claimed any specific structure that would overcome the teachings of '478. Note the status of the claims remains: claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-18 rejected, and claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 objected to .